



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bol for the open and close *e* that does not appear in the fourth edition of the *Formlære* the latest known to me. A valuable feature of Prof. Wimmer's work, a list of the Danish grammatical terms with the Latin Equivalents is, on the other hand, omitted. This is particularly unfortunate in a grammar intended for English readers, for whom such a word as *Medlydsammensmæltning* is, to say the least, an awkward substitute for *assimilation*. Indeed, it would be better still to omit the Danish terms altogether. Another omission, evidently a result of the severe condensation employed by the author, is the failure to give examples of the various phonetic changes discussed. The gain in space seems frequently to be made at the expense of clearness. The statement § 10, that 'final *g* is often lost in the strong preterits' might be improved by substituting 'as a rule' for 'often.' The treatment of nouns according to their stems is a marked improvement on Prof. Wimmer's classification by inflectional endings. In spite of its Danish form, this summing up of Old-Norse forms ought to prove of value for purposes of ready reference.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

FRENCH LANGUAGE.

The Academic French Course, in accordance with the latest Grammatical Rules adopted by the French Academy. By ANTOINE MUZZARELLI, Professor of Modern Languages and Literature. *First Year* (pp. 233 and pp. 66 vocabulary and index). American Book Co, Cincinnati.

Lectures faciles pour l'Etude du Français. Avec notes grammaticales et explicatives. By PAUL BERCY, B.L., L.D., Director of P. Bercy's School of Languages, N. Y. (Pp. 207, and pp. 48 notes and tables.) New York: W. R. Jenkins.

THE author does not believe in the "much vaunted Natural method." He adheres to the "Standard method," endeavoring at the same time to make his book "practical." We find rules on pronunciation, on the parts of speech, with plenty, a great plenty, of simple exer-

cises, lessons for recapitulation for written and oral use, and (pp. 166-181) a dozen short and simple pieces in French for translation and "general recapitulation," mainly by means of changes in gender, number, or person, indicated by the author. An appendix of fifty pages on "Syntax" contains very little of syntax, twenty-two pages being filled with paradigms of verbs and most of the remaining space with tables, lists, and rules for the formation of plural and feminine, etc. "The subjunctive mood, the irregular verbs and their derivatives, together with various other instruments of torture to a beginner, have been left over for the second year." (!) No subjunctive form occurs in the volume, except in the paradigms. Only very few errors have been noticed (p. 105, *Combien de cerises as-tu mangé?*). Teachers who share the author's pedagogical views will have no fault to find with his book.

The twenty-two short modern tales contained in M. Bercy's collection are entertaining and, in the main, well chosen. The author's plan, to teach French syntax in close connection with the text, by means of observation and induction, will commend itself to most teachers, and the 'notes grammaticales,' following each story, will prove an aid to this end, without hindering the teacher from modifying the course suggested, if he prefers. The book has no vocabulary, but a number of idioms and phrases are translated in notes at the end of the volume. This collection of stories may be used to good advantage also by teachers who do not approve of the author's method of teaching as set forth in his other publications.

A. LODEMAN.

Ypsilanti, Mich.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Michel Strogoff, par JULES VERNE, abridged and edited with notes by EDWIN SEELYE LEWIS, Ph. D., Princeton University. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1894. vii+222 pp., 12mo.¹ 3d. ed.

¹ In this third edition the editor has corrected a few (not all) typographical errors, and has added a short table of verbal endings (page 223). It would, perhaps, have been

DR. LEWIS thinks that an American student should begin reading French as soon as the regular verbs have been reached, and before attempting the irregular verbs; with this idea in view he edits the text noted above. Its distinguishing features are: 1. That all the irregular verbs in the text are referred by number to a list in the back of the book; 2. A classified list is given of subjunctives to which the notes constantly refer.

As the editor states in his preface, the list of irregular verbs and the treatment of the subjunctive are taken almost entirely from Whitney's *Grammar*; and, apparently, the only addition made to Whitney's list of irregular verbs is *dépendre*.³

"The unessential and least interesting parts [of the text], usually descriptive of people and scenery, have been cut out, and brief summaries in English made of them."

The result is a most interesting and concise tale in which my last year's Freshman class took keen interest.

It is a pity that Dr. Lewis did not add a map of the scene of action, as Prof. Edgren does in his *Le Tour du monde en Quatre-vingts Jours* (1894); for there are many geographical points for which students and instructor vainly look in the notes. The book is neatly printed in the main, although not a few typographical errors have escaped attention; thus, in the text:

Page. Line.

3,	26,	for <i>piétine</i>	read <i>piétine</i> .
9,	12,	" <i>intèrèt</i>	" <i>intèrèt</i> .
59,	22,	" <i>de</i>	" <i>des</i> .
63,	6,	" <i>le</i>	" <i>les</i> .
63,	14,	" <i>complètement</i>	" <i>complètement</i> .
93,	19,	" <i>mère</i>	" <i>mère</i> .
132,	16,	" <i>côte</i>	" <i>côté</i> .
139,	13,	" <i>complètement</i>	" <i>complètement</i> .
167,	8,	" <i>nuis</i>	" <i>nuits</i> .
171,	11,	" <i>le</i>	" <i>ne</i>

In the notes:

well to give the exceptions (*sommes, dites, faites*, etc.) to the forms *-ons* and *-ez* given in the table; or at least to mention that there are exceptions to the forms given.

² A most excellent plan.

³ The statement is made in the preface that a number of additions is given to Whitney's list.

Page. Line.

18,	2,	for 2	read 3.
28,	19,	" 19	" 10. (8)
48,	25,	" <i>eut</i>	" <i>eût</i> .
62,	24,	" 62	" 63.
71,	11,	" <i>quelquechose</i>	" <i>quelque chose</i> .
103,	6,	" <i>quelquechose</i>	" <i>quelque chose</i> . ⁴

The notes to the first part of the text are very full, and are later confined mostly to references to the list of subjunctives. Occasionally the expected note is lacking: page 6, "guidé par un instinct de *Delaware*"; page 15, "podaroshna"; pages 23 and 24, "tarentass" and "tèlègue" are not distinguished; page 25, "iemschik"; page 46, "kreml"; page 86, "Béranger"; page 128, "image de la Panaghia."

Sometimes the editor's statements seem rather vague: in the notes to page 2, lines 9 and 16, the student is told that *ce* is used in preference to *il* in "such expressions as these," and the note to page 3, line 32, refers him back to this explanation. Similarly, page 67, line 22, the editor, in a note to "pour qui," remarks: "this is one of the rare cases, in French, where the antecedent of the relative may be omitted"; but he does not explain just what constitutes the present case. Nor is it sufficient, in commenting on "ainsi que l'avait dit" (p. 6, l. 25), to assert that "*le*, the neuter pronoun, should seldom be translated in (?) English." The student does not know what "neuter pronoun" means, and looks in vain for a reference to the grammar. (Cf. p. 19, l. 15, note). The note to page 13, line 15: "*était-il* is here neuter, viz. 'was it'" (I quote the note entire), is not likely to make the point clear. How can *était-il* be neuter?

The translation of some passages would seem rather too free for the best interests of the elementary student; thus, '*cheval de fond*' (page 55, line 11) is translated: "of good qualities"; page 83, line 14, '*cela ne faisait*'

⁴ The following errors occur in the first edition (1893) and are corrected in the third:

Page 6, line	8, for <i>guide</i>	read <i>guidé</i> .
" 12, "	28, " <i>liseré</i>	" <i>liseré</i> .
" 57, "	3, " <i>main</i>	" <i>mains</i> .
" 91, "	11 and 17, " <i>côte</i>	" <i>côté</i> .

In the notes:

Page 13, line 30, for <i>lui même</i>	read <i>lui-même</i>
" 36, " 1, " <i>fut</i>	" <i>fût</i> .

pas l'affaire du correspondant': "this was not what the correspondent intended to allow"; page 117, line 32, 'tant bien que mal': "as far as it could"; page 167, line 9, 'à beaucoup près': "by a good deal"; page 170, line 8, 'en dehors de lui et par': "as owing not to him but to"; and page 172, line 27, 'avoir bon marché de': "to have soon done with." The translation is right, of course; is right in every case; but a text for beginners is not, I think, the place for free translation. It is not so much the idea as the grammatical construction, the syntax, the form, that is of paramount importance for beginners; and to my mind free translation (in notes or glossary) is the curse of modern elementary text-books.

But to return to the text.—In the note to page 3, line 8, the editor translates *du* in 'tête carrée du haut,' as "as to"; it would perhaps have been well to add that *de* here, is, as usual, the English "of"; as, in "strong of limb" and the like. In the note to line 11 of the same page (3), 'venait à' is explained, and 'venir de' is treated in the notes to pages 7 and 17, lines 22 and 12 respectively; but *venir* without following preposition is not mentioned. One note should have explained the three uses.

I trust that more intelligent students than those whom I have had to teach, will not argue from the translation "nothing less than" given in 'Le gros gibier n'était rien de moins que l'ours sibérien,' that, if the game were nothing, less than it was bear, it could not have been bear—for bear it undoubtedly was (p. 5. l. 12). The note should have added that the *de* is here partitive. Page 5, line 23, note; 'manquer de' does not always mean "to fail to"; the statement should be restricted. And page 14, line 31: Is the inversion in 'Aussi . . . les portières s'ouvriraient-elles, et les voyageurs, effarés, n'eurent-ils qu'une pensée,' due, as the editor states, to vivid narration, or merely to the fact that *aussi* usually requires such inversion when it begins a sentence? Again, the translation "whose only profile," "whose single profile" is scarcely satisfactory for 'dont le seul profil' (p. 17, l. 10, note); nor is there necessarily any difference in the meaning of the expression given and that of 'dont le profil

seul,' which Dr. Lewis contrasts with it.

The note to p. 27, line 20, calls attention to the omission of *pas* after *pouvoir*. Why not add *savoir*, *cesser* and *oser*? Is it not only by taking advantage of such "openings" that syntax can be successfully taught? If it be true, as we are told in the note to page 49, line 22, that "*tout* before a feminine adjective or noun, has the feminine form *toute* only when the following adjective or noun begins with a consonant," how does the editor account for such constructions as 'toute autre chose' (Cf. Littré)?

Finally, few, I think, will agree with the editor that 'il nous va falloir nous séparer' (p. 116, l. 20, note) "would be grammatical but inelegant." Is it not ungrammatical as well as inelegant?

Possibly the biographical note is the least essential part of an elementary text-book; Dr. Lewis has apparently so considered it in the book before us. It seems surprising that he should have found "the material already in existence for Jules Verne's life most meagre and contradictory"; at least it would seem strange until we find his sources. Neither Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia* nor the *American Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica* can be considered final sources for the biography of contemporary French writers, and a cursory glance at the articles on Jules Verne (or the fact that he is not mentioned) in Lorenz,⁵ Larousse,⁶ Weller,⁷ Cushing,⁸ Quérard,⁹ Sommervogel¹⁰ and Vapereau¹¹—or any one of them—would have doubtless induced the editor to discard as highly improbable the statement made in *The Dial*¹² and

⁵ *Catalogue général de la librairie française*, t. iv, 1871, s. v.

⁶ *Dict. du XIX^e siècle*, t. xv, 1876, s. v.

⁷ Weller, Emil; *Lexicon Pseudonymorum*, 2nd ed., 1886. Not mentioned.

⁸ *Anonyms*, 1889. Not mentioned.

⁹ *Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées*, 3e éd., t. iii, 1870. Not mentioned.

¹⁰ *Dict. des ouvr. anonymes et pseud.*, 1884. Not mentioned.

¹¹ *Dict. univ. des contemp.*, 5e éd., Paris, 1880.

¹² Vol. xiv, p. 289; the article is "a quotation from the *London Literary World*."

quoted by him, that the novelist is a native of Warsaw, Olchewitz by name, and that "Verne" is but a translation of the "initial syllable of his family patronymic";¹³ and such reading would also have convinced him¹⁴ that the author of the work edited was born at Nantes, February 8, 1828, a Frenchman of France, and not in 1814 as the American Supplement of the *Britannica* (I believe alone) supposes.

[I received the following letter from Jules Verne after the review, given above, had been written :

Amiens, le 17 Avril, 1895.

Cher Monsieur,

Je me hâte de répondre à votre aimable lettre que je viens de recevoir à l'instant. Elle a couru à Nantes, puis à Paris, et elle est arrivée à Amiens, ma ville d'adoption, où je demeure depuis 25 ans. La fable ou légende que vous me citez, j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de la démentir. Non, je ne suis point Polonais. Je suis Français, né à Nantes, 8 février 1828, de parents français, mon père étant originaire des environs de Paris (Provins, Brie) et ma mère de la Basse-Bretagne (Morlaix). C'est être déjà vieux que d'être né en 1828, et je proteste absolument contre la date de 1814. Il me faudrait encore un certain nombre d'années pour achever l'oeuvre des Voyages Extraordinaires! Y arriverais-je à les avoir? ... qui sait, si ce n'est la Providence!

Veuillez me compter parmi vos amis, cher monsieur, moi qui compte bien des amis, je crois, dans les Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

[JULES VERNE.]

W. STUART SYMINGTON, JR.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

I MUST thank Mr. Symington for the foregoing review, and am only sorry it did not appear sooner, so that use might have been made of it in the preparation of my third edition of *Michel Strogoff*. There are one or two suggestions, however, conveyed by this review, which, in justice to myself, should be corrected.

In such words as *complètement*, I retain

¹³ Dr. Lewis does not notice that *Verne* is not "beech" but "alder." See preface.

¹⁴ The editor gives his readers the choice of the two dates (1814 and 1828), but adds in the foot-note: "So far as I know at present, this [1828] is the correct statement." It may be of interest to know that M. Jules Troubat, librarian at the *Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, kindly confirmed my opinions as expressed above.

Verne's spelling, for he often uses an acute accent over the *e* immediately preceding a mute *e*; for the same reason do I retain the hyphen between *très* and a following adjective. I thought every American student would understand the reference to a "Delaware"; *podaroshna* is explained, I think, in the course of the text, and I give translations for *tarentass*, *télégue*, *ienschik* and *kreml*. Such expressions would be as strange to a French boy as they are to our young students, and I think it is really a mistake to weary the latter with too frequent notes, which would then, I fear, be read only by the instructor. As for the note on *pour qui*, it should have been quoted in full (the reference is to p. 6, l. 22); this is the final statement: "the full expression would be *pour celui qui*, the shorter *pour qui* being more indefinite."¹ I rather like the term "neuter pronoun," which I am by no means the first to use, but it is true that *était-il* cannot be neuter, any more than "was it" in English; this reading will be changed in the next edition.

Now we come to the use of free translation with American students. If it be true that "free translation is the curse of modern elementary text-books," I think it no less true that "literal translation is the bane of modern language teaching in all grades," and I have in mind more than one edition of French texts. In other words, the two extremes are injurious. I often give the literal translation of French expressions, generally accompanied with a rendering into idiomatic English. Sometimes I do not give this literal paraphrasing, and for obvious reasons, especially when the words are common. For example, how do the following sentences sound in English: "Horse of depth," "this did not make the affair of the correspondent," "as well as badly," "to a good deal near," "outside of him and by," "have cheap of?" No, there are times when a literal translation is nothing short of absurd, though the instructor must be most careful not to allow free translation to be synonymous with careless translation.

¹ And so with my rendering of *manquer de* on p. 5, l. 23; I translate it here so as to help the student in this particular passage. A glance at any French dictionary, under *manquer* would show the need of such assistance.